Ft. 92 & 97.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1890–91

191 .

(L. R.)

File No. 81 & 90.

Serial Nos. 1 to 7

Later references.

L R. 83 & 93.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 7.

~~Part~~ B for November 1890.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of ~~Hiriyane Gowda and Mandlagiri Gowda~~ Venkatē Gowda, regarding the Patēli of Kaygere and others, Kunigal taluk

Commissioner

Indexed

W D 950—G C B—30,000—29-1-15

(1)

Precis of Canarese correspondence in re the Potélships of Kegere, Nidamaravinapuradu Stenlā and an Amrut Mahal Kaval in the Kunigal Taluq of the Tumkur District.

27th December 1888.

From the deposition of Kegere Venkatē Gowda, it is understood that the Amildar of Kunigal had issued a notice to him, duly informing of the necessity of appointing three separate Potels to the three places noted in the margin, whose Offices were rendered into salaried appointments in the Survey Settlement.

Kegere, Stenlā and Kaval

2. In the above deposition, the said Venkatē Gowda desired to have the three Offices for himself, inasmuchas Stenlā and Kaval were one but not separate Villages and the same were very near to his Village — Kegere — and also desired that in case ~~of his~~ ~~name~~ he was not registered for the three Offices, his sons may be appointed.

21st December 1888

3. One Therivomalagiri Gowda (Respondent) made an application

to the Amildar of Hunigal bringing to notice that he was a Shareholder in Hegere and Stunta, that his ancestors were Potels of those places formerly, that he himself was Potel till the year 1876, when of his own will and accord, the Potelships were transferred to Govinda Gowda's name (father of the Appellant) as he was an educated man, that after this transaction the appellant and his father became Potels ~~two~~ and lastly prayed that he might be given one of the Potelships of the above Villages.

4. In proof of his having assisted the appellant in the despatch of Govmt work, the said Theroomalagiri Gowda produced 5 references he had with the above. Of these, 2 are addressed and superscribed as "Theroomalagiri Gowda of the Kegere Village", one as "Potel of the Kegere Village", and the remaining two as "Theroomalagiri Gowda, Kegere Potel Shareholder." These references ~~were~~ are made in Connection

X Kegere

(9)

connection with different subjects, such as the prevention of Cattle grazing on certain lands, the check of the spread of the Cholera disease in a certain Village, the repairing of certain tanks and the like.

14th February 1889.

5. Appellant Venkatè Gowda made an application to the Amildar of Kunigal, with 7 references made to his father, to prove his title to the Potèl-ships of the three places above. Of these, five relate to the cultivation of certain lands and to certain repairs; one dated 14th October 1882 is an endorsement given to the father of the appellant by the Amildar, appointing him, subject to confirmation, as Potèl of Hunta; and the last that is the 7th is dated 18th August 1847 and is without seal and signature. It purports to be a copy of the Docket written by the Amildar to Yedayeor Summatta Shetty-dar Lakkegowda, duly informing that Official of the appointment of Govinda Gowda,

the

the father of the Appellant to the Potelship of the Village of Hunta.

Re. 256 dated 3-7-86 is an endorsement granted to the appellant, transferring to his name, at the instance of his father, the two Potel-ships of Hegere and Hunta.

6. The Amildar issued notice to the parties and after examining them and their witnesses submitted a report. 12th February 1890
The prosecution witnesses corroborate the statement of the Appellant and the defence witnesses that of the Respondent.

7. In his report the Amil stated that the Offices of the three places noted in the margin, had been, in the Survey Settlement, rendered into appointments carrying fixed salaries, that the appellant was then the Potel of those three places and that one and two places formed what was called Amani-kere. The Appellant-Venkatesh Govinda claimed the Potel-ships on the authority that

1. Hunta, 2. Karal and 3. Hegere.

(5)

Copy thereof is in the file

that on 18th August 1847 an order had been issued to Sheikdave Lukkegowda appointing his father to the Potelship of Hemlè and that in 1882 Rvc Syed Nasaroodeen Saheb, while there on jamabundy duty also appointed his father to the Potelship of that village; he therefore prayed that the Potelships might be allowed to be enjoyed by him and his sons.

8. The Amildar represented further in the above report that one Thevumalagiri Gowda ~~had come~~ came forward as shareholder in the Potelships under reference and produced certain records in proof of his having now and then executed Government work in his capacity as Potel and complained that the Appellant objected to pay him his Miras. fee and solicited therefore that one of the Potelships might be given to his eldest son.

9. The Appellant totally re-
-pudiated the Respondents
claim to the Poleloheipo and
denied his being a sharer with
him in the same; and also
failed to account and explain
how the Respondents name
was entered under the Columns
of Shareholders in the Register
The Respondent was declared
to be a Shareholder with
the Appellant, both by records
and evidence of the other
Shareholders.

10. The Amildar further
pointed out in his report
that in 1882 there was an
order by the Apeilant Comm^r.
to the effect that there was no
claimant whatever to the
Poleloheipo of the Village of
Wedamavin apuiada Hunta;
that the appellants father had
been appointed on probation
as Polel to the same, and that
if the Probationer were found
incompetent, one Thimmay
Gowda may be appointed

11. From the above, the Amildar Concluded that there existed no claimant to the Polelship of Hunta and its Amrut mahal in Kaval and that the Govern^t were at liberty to appoint any man they like, according to qualifications. But with the respect to that part of the order by the Spell Comm^r. Viz. that one Theimmay Gowda might be appointed, in case Govinda Gowda was found unfit, the Amildar observed that the said Theimmay Gowda could not be appointed, as he was already a registered Polel for the Village of Thiffoor. It had become absolutely necessary to engage a separate Polel to the Village of Hunta, as it formed a big Village and afforded sufficient work in the shape of collections &c to one man.

Accordingly the Amildar appointed the Respondent to be the Polel of the Village of Hunta and the Appellant to be the Polel of Kegere and

the

also the Amrut mahal Kaval attached to Kunta. (5)

12. The Deputy Commissioner approved of the appointments made by the Amildar and conveyed the order of confirmation in his no 535-d(26-3-90

13. The Appellant now appeals against the said order of the Dy Comr.

AV

SNP

(9)

Appellant
Venkatê gowda
by
Advocate Mr. Paramasiva Iyer.

vs

Respondent
Thimmay gowda
by Advocate Mr. L. Sreeni
- Vasa Iyengar.

with T. Narasimha Iyengar

Kunigal Taluk.

affts as
Peon in Taluk Nr 85 d)
X 18th Sept 1847 — affts produced.
duly affirmed to the duties
committed to the Munsiff
Taluk Kunigal.

Taluk 1882. Entered in
Taluk Tabbitch —— shows
there was no person Lakka
Gowda Sandra (affts 7)
appointed as such in ... Taluk
that he proceeded Eventually
to ... appointed the Munsiff
in ... he complained on Lakka
Gowda Sandra — (Last Sept.)
In 1886 on the appointment Venkta
Gowda — appointed on him
(affts) — 3 — 7 — 86.

⊗ Cutter of Gowda
in Nedamaranahalli
pura Mantha.

Original Taluk of 1851 ⊗ — To Kempe
Nidamaranahalli pura Gowda Gowda —
Malur Kempanna
and — ... regarding some
Kaluvu matt.
X 7 Aug 1847 — Kempe
Feb 1848 Kempe Mutt 53.

(10)

1864 - Kassen · Grundschuld
1847 ⋮ Curhess Kassen - Hanau
Hy. ——— Grundschuld

1864 ——
1873/74 Kassen · Grundschuld

(11)

Rn No 643 of
8th Aug 1892

(1)

Appt — } Respts
Venkalagowda } Timmegowda
& others

Appellant's father

(2)

was the Patel
of the villages
in
probation
appointed
1882-83. In the order of
it is stated that there under
the Patel of
the appellant's father was appointed
as the Patel of the Villages.
Subsequently
Patel of
villages
noted in the margin. In 1886,
father
1 Reggare
& Ravve
was appointed in
the place of his father, here
the order
of Huntas & Raggeri, but
obtained
in Ravè.
In February 1890, the amildar
reported that the appellant
was not managing
all the 3 villages, and
that the D.C. comm

1886

Appointed Appellant (12) Appellants Respt
as Patail of Rajgeri
& Kalwa, & Respt
as Patail of Utent as
In their order of appointment
Respt is stated to be
Hasildar.—

Appellant appeals
against the order & states
(1) that the office of Patail
was not vacant for
Utent in 1882, but
that it was her ancestral
stock.—

(2) that Respt was not a
Hasildar & was not
entitled to the office

In support of his point
appellant produced
Jahid, dated 10th 1853,
issued in the name of
his father — The Talati
appears to be genuine

As regards the 2nd point
the Lower Court held Respt
is a Dajgee of the appellant
& a Hasildar in the
office of Patail for the
village Rajgeri.—

Whether the Respt
is a Hasildar or not
the question is, is there
any reason for removing
the appellant from

1 6th August 1871 Jahid
to Respt father—

2 20 March 1876, Letter
Respt father — make
over the Patail papers
refers to Rajgeri—

3 10 Sept 1875 to
— (name illegible)
to [illegible]
Dandy Jamadar—

4 13 Oct 1882 to
Respt father as
[illegible] Patil

1853, [illegible]

the appellant was doing the
duties of a Patil

Rajgeri — they
Utent Court
1882 Court held Respt father
& Hasil Respt father
was the Patil — not
doing duties—

(15)

L. R. 81-90-1

(General Serial No. 32.)

1890.—91

No. 643

Name of Petitioner. Venkate Gauda son of Govinda Gauda residing in

Village. Kaggere

Taluk. Kunigal Tk

District. Tumkur

Date of Arzi. 3—7—90

Date of Receipt. Do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 3

By Advocate Mr Paramesiva Iyer of Bangalore

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the order of the Dy Comr of the Tumkur Dt depriving Petr of the Patelship of Nedemavinapura Ane Hanta and appointing Respondent Timme Gauda.

Order appealed against was passed under Rule 1 Cl. 1 of Council Rules—

Copy produced.

Appeal petition properly stamped & is in time—

Submitted to the Council—

10/7/90 AE

Ad

L. R. 81-90-1

(16)

L. R. 81-90-2.

No 241. (2) 1817

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 643

dated 8-5 July 1890 received at the

Dewan's Office from Venkata Gowda

of Kaggere in the Kunigal

Taluk

is forwarded, together with its three

enclosures, to the Deputy Commis-

sioner of the Tumkur Dis-

trict for the submission

of the Proge connected

with the case.

L. R. 81-90-2

By Order,

BANGALORE,
14th/18 July 1890

Draft
for Chief Secretary

The Councillor
Mr Chentsal
Row's orders
Instd.

P. 102 (17) (3)

(General Serial No. 29.)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE. 3723 2-AUG.90 204

1890

L. R. 81-90-3.

From The Chief Commissioner Coorg District

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated Coorg 25th July 1890.

Despatched

Received L.R. 81-90-3

Enclosures No. 4 & Memo

General No. 214 1890-91.

Subject Land Revenue

Memo No. 241 dated 18th Instant calling for the record connected with the Patailiship of Veeraymangala and Nanthe, Kunigal Taluk.

Has the honor to submit the record called for in the above, and to return the appeal petition with its enclosures.

Chief Commissioner Coorg Dist.

Petition dft 1/8/90

S. Krishnarow for precis early. 5/8/90.

precis subd. 7/8/90.

A1 4-8-90

Sec 2

Petition Office
3/7/90

(18)



No 643

To

Recd 3/7/90

The Government of His Highness the
Maha Raja of Mysore
Bangalore.

Revenue appeal No. of 1890.

Case for Prosecution
14/7/1890

Appellant—

Venkatē gowda son of Govinda gowda, Potail residing in Kaggerē Kunigal Taluk—

Respondent—

Thimmē gowda son of Thirumulaiya gowda residing in Kaggerai Kunigal Taluk.

The appellant above named most respectfully begs to appeal against the Order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District depriving the appellant of the Potailship of Nedē-manimapoorada Anē Hantha on the following ground:-

1 Respondent had not a shadow of a right to the Anē Hantha Potēli and the

(1) That the Deputy Commissioner erred in appointing him (Respondent) to the same.

Bangalore
3rd July 1890

Advocate for Appellant

(40)

ಪರವಾನೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸನ್ನದು.

ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ ಡಿಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮ್ಮಿಷನರ್ ಯವರಿಂದ

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹೋಬಳಿಯ

ಗ್ರಾಮದ ವಾಸಸ್ಥನಾದ ಮಗ ಗ.

ನಿನ್ನ ಗೌರವನನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ನಿನ್ನ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಪಟೇಲನಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಎಂಬ ಮುಖ್ಯೇ ಬಾಬುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿನ್ನ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಯಾವವೆಂದರೆ:—

೧ನೇದು.—ಕೆರೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ದುರಸ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಿಡುವದು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಸೂಲಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದು.

೨ನೇದು.—ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ಬಾಜೂಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯಣ ಸಾಲ್ ಮರಗಳ ವುಸ್ತುವಾರೀಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವದು ಮತ್ತು ಆವಶ್ಯಕವಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ಸಸಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಸುವದು.

೩ನೇದು.—ಬೆಟ್ಟಗಳ ಮೇಲಣ ಜಂಗಲೀಗಳ ವುಸ್ತುವಾರೀಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವದು ಅವುಗಳು ನಾಶಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡದಂತೆ ಕಾಪಾಡುವದು.

೪ನೇದು.—ಸರ್ವೇ ಯಿಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಹಾಕಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಬಾಂದುಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಯಿತರ ಸರಹದ್ದು ಗುರ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವದು.

ಪೊಲೀಸ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

ನೀನು ಜಾಗರೂಕತೆವುಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ನಿನ್ನ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರಹದ್ದಿನೊಳಗೆ ಖೂನಿ, ಚೋರಿ, ಡಕಾಯಿತಿ ಎಂಬ ದರೋಡೆ, ಕಳವು ಯಾ ಯಿತರ ದೊಡ್ಡ ತಪ್ಪಿತಗಳು ನಡೆದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೀನು ಪತ್ತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಯಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕಟ್ಟೆ ಹೆಸರು ಹೊಂದಿದವರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲ್ಪಡುವಂಥಾ ಮತ್ತು ಜೀವನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಿರಂಗವಾದ ಯೇನೊಂದು ರಹ ಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಿರುವಂಥಾ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು ಅಥವಾ ಕಳ್ಳ ಜಾತಿಯವರಾದ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು ನಿನ್ನ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಯಲ್ಲವೊಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಪೊಲೀಸ ಆಫಿಸರಿಗೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ನೀನು ಪೊಲೀಸ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ನಡದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೋಟಿ, ಮತ್ತು ನೀರು ಗಂಟಿ, ಪೊಲೀಸ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಳವಾರನು ನಿನ್ನ ತಾಬ್ದೇದಾರರಾಗಿರುವರು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ನೀನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರನ್ನು ನಿನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಿಡಕೂಡದು, ನಿನ್ನ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿ ವುಂಟಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೂ ನೀನು ನಡಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಈ ಸನ್ನದು ಬಹುಮಾನದ ಗೌರವವೆಂದು ಯೆಣಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ನೀನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿ ನಡಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೆ ತಪ್ಪಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸನ್ನದು ನಿನ್ನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸ್ ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲ್ಪಡುವದು.

ತಾರೀಖು. 1940

Dy. Commr.
Dharwar District.

(21)

16 August 91

(22)

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

ಸ 1890 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ



ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

ಗೆ

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ, ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತ್ವೈಮು ವಗೈರೆ ತಗದು ಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂನಹಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದೇನೆ ಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದುಯಿದ್ದುನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 6 ನೇ
ಸ 1890 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ

ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೋಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಲ್ಲೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇವರು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

(93)

(General Serial No. 3) (5)

189 .

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

L. R. 81-90-4

To

The Dy: Comm^r
Tumkur D.

Dated 14
Despatched } October/90.
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 8276
No. 286

H^is No. 2148 of 25^th July last. Submitting the records connected with the Patelship of Nedaymanipura and Kanthanhalli in the Kunigal Taluk.

—o—

With reference to the above he has the honor to request that the Barabalotte Registers of the village in question for as many years as may be available, may be submitted as early as date as practicable.

Dr/s/.

By order

W.

AR.

Asst.

(General Serial No. 29.)

1890.

From The Dy. Commissioner
Tumkur District

L. R. 81-90-5

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Durwan~~
Government—of Mysore.
Bangalore.

Dated 20th Oct. 1890.

Despatched 24.

Received

Enclosures No. 6 in a separate packet

General No. 447 1890:91.
No.

His docket No. 8276/286
dated the 11th Instant.

Has the honor to submit the marginally noted Barabalotti Registers of the village of Nadémavinapur Ané Hanla in the Hunigal Taluk

Dy. Commissioner.

Fdb

1 Register (Khadé Bund) of 1842
1 — do — of 1846-47
1 — do — 1847.
1 — do — 1864
2 — do — 1873-74.

B2
F-11-90

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore

L. R. 81-90-6 Appeal No. 643 of 3rd July 1890.

Appellant. Vs. Respondent

Venkategowda of Keggare, Kunigal Talk. Timmegowda, son of Tirumalegowda.

Decision. 22.11.90.

Appellant's father was appointed Patel of the village of Hunta on probation in 1882/83. In the order of appointment it is stated that there were no hukdars to the village and that the appellant's father was appointed as he lived in the village. Petitioner's father was also the Patel of 2 more villages noted in the margin. In 1886 Appellant was appointed in the place of his father, but this order of 1886 refers only to villages of Hunta and Keggeri, but not to Kaval. In Feb: 1890 the Amildar reported that the appellant could not well manage all the three villages, and on this the Dy: Commr: appointed Appellant as Patel of Keggare and Kaval, and the Respt as Patel of Hunta. In this order of appointment Respt is stated to be Hissedar.

Appellant appeals against this

X
1. Keggare.
2. Kaval.

order and states

(1) that the office of Patel was not newly created for Aunta in 1882, but that it was his ancestral right,

+(2) that Respt is not a Hissedar and is not entitled to the office.

In support of the 1st point appellant produces the Takids issued by the Amildar in 1847, 1851 and 1853 in the name of his father. The Takids appear to be genuine and shew that appellant's father was then doing the duties of a Patel.

As regards the 2nd point, the records shew that Respt is a Vayadee of the appellant and a Hissedar in the office of Patel for the village Keggeri.

Whether the Respt is a Hissedar or not, the question is, is there any reason for removing the appellant from the office for any of the villages to which he was formally appointed. Beyond the statement of the Amildar that appellant is unable to manage all the three villages there is nothing to shew that he is unequal to the charge. The order of the Dy. Comm^r appointing Respondent Patel of Aunta will therefore

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore

Appeal No. of

Appellant. Vs. Respondent

Decision.

be cancelled and the appellant restored to office.

By order

Under Secretary.

Copy forwarded to the Dy. Commr, Tumkur Dt, with the records & Registers received with his Nos 214 & 447 dd 25th July & 20th Oct 1890.

By order

Under Secretary.

VD

(General Serial No. 30). (8)

1890.

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr
Tumkur Distt

Dated 11
Despatched 15 } December
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 10192
No. 346 P 767.

Passing orders on the case of Venkategowda of Keggere Kunigal Taluk, Vs Demegowda son of Immalegowda.

No. 643 L.R. 81-90-7 (27)

Appellant.
Venkategowda of Kyggere
Kunigal Taluk.

Vs

Respondent
Timmegowda, Son of
Tirumalegowda.

Endorsement. 3/22.11.90.

In reply to his Petition dated 3rd July 1890. Petitioner is informed that the order of the Dy: Commr: appointing Respondent Patel of Aunta has been cancelled and that the Dy: Commr: has been directed to restore Petr: to office.

The enclosures are herewith returned.

11/12

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
189 .

By Order,

Secretary.